

Preventing Contemporary Intergroup Violence

David A. Hamburg

1993

The world of the next century will be different in profound respects from any that we have ever known before -- deeply interdependent economically, closely linked technologically, and progressively more homogenized through the movement of information, ideas, people, and capital around the world at unprecedented speed. At the same time, it will be more multicentric in the devolution of economic, political, and military power to smaller adaptable units. Some nations will undergo a perilous fragmentation, as the centralizing forces that once held people together are pulled apart and traditional concepts of national sovereignty and nationhood are contested, sometimes violently. How these tendencies will be reconciled is far from clear. One of the most striking facts of our time is the way technology has come to dominate and organize our lives, presenting unimaginable benefits, opportunities, and choices within a matter of decades, yet unleashing the destructive power of advanced weaponry that in an instant of history can do immense damage, even destroy humanity.

While the more complex and contradictory world that we have entered is of our own making, we often approach its problems with the biological orientations and emotional responses of our ancient ancestry, bringing attitudes, customs, and institutions that were formed largely in earlier times and that are perhaps no longer appropriate. Foremost is our tendency as a species toward prejudice, egocentrism, and ethnocentrism. In these times of rapid world transformation, as people have flowed like floodwaters across the earth, families, social support networks, old ways of forming group solidarity, and other traditional patterns of living have been strained or broken apart. Many individuals feel a heightened sense of uncertainty and insecurity. Some react with exaggerated intolerance of the outside world or with violence toward those who are seen as alien and threatening. Political demagogues can readily inflame these feelings in a context of severe vulnerability.

The historical record is full of every sort of slaughter based on the human capability to make invidious distinctions between in-groups and out-groups -- often associated with the frustration of fundamental drives, deeply felt beliefs about identity, or a sense of jeopardy to group survival. In this century -- a period of the most rapid industrialization and wrenching transition -- human slaughter far exceeds any that has gone before. Just since the United Nations was formed in 1945, there have been upwards of 150 small-scale wars resulting in more than 20 million dead and easily four times that many disabled or displaced. Millions have perished at the hands of their own countrymen in Cambodia, Indonesia, Burundi, Nigeria, Paraguay, Tibet, Uganda, Angola, and the Sudan. Most recently the former Yugoslavia has generated at least 150,000 dead and more than two million refugees.

Today worldwide, fed by the powerful currents of aggressive ethnic nationalism, there is a virtual epidemic of armed civil or intranational conflict -- the kind often thought of as "internal" but that can readily spill over the borders of nation-states. While international attention has been on the savage fighting in Bosnia, long-simmering antagonisms among deeply mingled ethnic groups have come to the surface in the successor states to the Soviet Union -- exacerbated

by the harsh economic conditions that prevail there as well as by the erosion of social norms. Hundreds of such nationality “hot spots” exist in these vast territories. Sixty-five million people in the former Soviet Union do not live in their primary areas of origin, and many are fearful about their treatment as minorities in the new nations. The international community is only just beginning to realize the potential gravity of these various conflicts. Russia herself, with her huge arsenal of nuclear weapons, has shown serious signs of instability.

New Wine in Old Bottles

Intergroup conflict is an ancient part of the human legacy, and tyrants have long understood how to exploit for their own ends the human tendency to attribute malevolence primarily or solely to other groups, deflecting anger onto the hated others, who are blamed for all their troubles. Many different political, social, economic, and pseudoscientific ideologies have been mobilized to support hostile positions toward those who are outside the primary community or who deviate from community norms.

All that is very old and once upon a time may have been adaptive, but these characteristics of our species have become exceedingly dangerous, primarily because of the enormous destructive power of the advanced weaponry we have created. Weapons themselves do not cause dangerous conflicts, but their availability in large quantities can easily intensify and prolong such conflicts. The use of sophisticated technology, moreover, enhances the risk that the consequences of local wars will become regional or global.

While nuclear warheads, which can be carried by missiles with tremendous accuracy over great distances, represent the ultimate in human violence, the increased killing power of enhanced conventional, chemical, and biological weapons also has the potential for making life everywhere miserable and disastrous. In the past, no matter how ferocious the conflict, humanity could not destroy itself even if it wanted to. Now it can. One of the most serious problems the world will face in the next decade is the proliferation throughout the world of these modern deadly weapons -- or the knowledge and technical capability for making them -- and the looming possibility that they will be used.

In this post-Cold War environment of many small wars and potentially large ones, a new approach to international problem solving may be needed. The system of international diplomacy that evolved over the past two centuries focused on power relations between nation-states. Yet the risks, costs, casualties, and tragedies of the twentieth century should tell us, if nothing else does, that this may be far from an optimal system for dealing with conflict between peoples of the same nation -- or the problem of weapons proliferation.

Attachment and Aggression

The capacity for attachment and the capacity for violence are fundamentally connected in human beings. We fight with other people in the belief that we are protecting ourselves, our loved ones, and the group with which we identify most strongly. Altruism and aggression are intimately linked in war and other conflicts. My lifetime has witnessed terrible atrocities committed in the name of some putatively high cause. Yet there have also been vivid examples

of the reconstruction of societies, major reconciliations, and real enlargement of opportunities for substantial segments of a population. What are the conditions under which the outcome can go one way or the other? If we could understand such questions better, maybe we could learn to tilt the balance in favor of a stable, enduring peace among human groups in the twenty-first century.

Even though in-group/out-group distinctions are ubiquitous in human societies, easy to learn and hard to forget, there is certainly the possibility that we humans can learn to minimize these tendencies. This may be one of the crucial roads we have to travel in order to cope with conflict in the transformed world of the future. Can we find a basis for common human identification across a diversity of cultures and national groups?

Below, I try to sketch some promising lines of inquiry and innovation that bear strongly on the two-sided coin of human cooperation and conflict and that suggest ways the world's institutions can cope with burgeoning threats to international peace. It is worth considering how the various approaches to the prevention of the deadliest conflicts and the promotion of international cooperation might be strengthened, particularly in light of superordinate goals essential for the future of humanity and our habitat.

The Search for Understanding

Given the myriad possibilities for world conflagration, the nature and sources of human conflict are deserving of the most careful and searching attention. Yet, until quite recently they have not been a major focus of systematic analysis and even today are rather marginalized in the world's great research and educational institutions. The scientists and scholars heavily engaged in such inquiry have been largely lacking in support. The field of ethnic conflict resolution, moreover, is relatively new and weakly institutionalized. The international community has nothing like an effective system for preventing the deadliest conflicts.

The powerful sectors of society everywhere, for their part, have tended to be complacent about such matters and to see them as someone else's problem, far away. Avoidance often substitutes for foresight, authority for evidence, and blaming for problem solving. The capacity for wishful thinking, as it is for self-justification, seems boundless in matters of human conflict.

All this may be beginning to change now, stimulated by deep concerns about the dangers of contemporary conflict and by the belated recognition of the ubiquity of killing and maiming in human experience. Conflicts have become everyone's business. The idea that states and peoples are free to conduct their quarrels, no matter how deadly, is outdated in the nuclear age and in a shrinking world where local hostilities can rapidly become international ones with devastating consequences. Similarly, the notion that tyrants are free to commit atrocities on their own people is rapidly becoming obsolete.

A substantial body of careful empirical research on conflict resolution and international peacemaking, detailing the historical experience with forms of negotiation, mediation, arbitration, recognition, and power sharing is at last beginning to emerge, and the results are providing new insights and guidelines useful to practitioners. It is apparent that there is no single approach to conflict resolution that offers overriding promise. Just as the sources and

manifestations of human conflict are immensely varied, so too are the approaches to understanding, preventing, and resolving conflicts.

The field can benefit from more dynamic interplay between theory and practice. The great challenge is to move with a sense of urgency to organize a broader and deeper effort to understand these issues and, above all, to develop more effective ways in the real world of preventing and resolving conflicts short of disaster.

Additionally, there needs to be serious worldwide education about forms of nonviolent problem solving that can generate public support. The price of resolving international disputes by force of arms is becoming too high -- even putative winners are beginning to recognize this unwelcome fact. But finding workable alternatives that are broadly acceptable, particularly in the realm of preventive systems, will challenge the international community beyond any prior experience. While it is certainly not beyond possibility to move this subject higher on the agenda of this nation and others, it will require a much deeper grasp of the dangers among leadership groups and the general public than now exists.

Sovereignty and Self-Determination

Most people everywhere live in multiethnic societies. Worldwide there are several thousand ethnic groups versus fewer than two hundred nation-states. In Europe, as in Africa, national borders were in large part imposed by external powers without regard to geography or shared ethnicity. Conditions were created in which members of the same identity group were split apart, leaving open the possibility that all groups could make territorial claims on each other. If now every ethnic, religious, racial, linguistic, or cultural group sought to establish its own nation, there would be no limit to fragmentation -- precipitating violence, immense suffering, and a flow of refugees on an unimaginable scale.

Sometimes in the modern world it is possible to separate out ethnic groups that wish to have their own nation-state and create a situation in which borders essentially coincide with a living space of that particular group; but this is unusual. Although secession may be carried off democratically and peacefully, as in Czechoslovakia, this is rare, and the quest to create a separate state or redraw borders will usually prove to be a chimera.

The attractive concept of self-determination was given an idealistic boost after both world wars, but the conflict in Bosnia shows how dangerous sudden secessions, rationalized on the basis of self-determination, can be. The creation of new states by sudden secession may trigger fierce fighting not only within a country but also across international borders. There is ample evidence of this in the states of the former Soviet Union, where the problem is complicated by an immense armory of highly destructive weapons. So the concept of self-determination will have to be reassessed in light of contemporary circumstances and the conflicting values involved clarified and dealt with peacefully.

Beyond this, there is an urgent need to create the conditions under which various identity groups can sort out their differences and learn to live in a state of harmonious interaction with their neighbors. Ways must be found to foster self-esteem, meaningful group membership, and

internal cohesion without the necessity for harsh depreciation of out-groups and without resort to violence in the event of a clash of interests.

A fundamental requisite of mutual accommodation is development of a genuinely free civil society within a democratic framework, where there is truly equal citizenship, respect for human rights, protection against the abuse of power, freedom to express differences openly and constructively, and a fair distribution of opportunities. Many paths to mutual accommodation are possible: nonviolent agreed secession; peaceful, negotiated territorial border revision; federation or confederation; regional or functional autonomy; and respected cultural pluralism, within each nation and across national boundaries. Each case presents a particular set of opportunities and constraints, and each solution will inevitably be reached only after painful deliberation, taxing the patience and support of all. Whatever the outcome, it must eventually satisfy the reasonable claims of most citizens, though not necessarily the intolerant militants or extremists.

Shared Goals of a Single Worldwide Species

To an increasing extent, we will have to learn to broaden our social identifications in light of shared interests and superordinate goals across all of humanity. We must come to think of ourselves in a fundamental sense as a single interdependent, meaningfully attached, extended family. This is in fact what we are; but to state this is not to assimilate it as a psychological reality.

Superordinate goals have the potentially powerful effect of unifying disparate groups in the search for the vital benefit that can be obtained only by their cooperation. Such goals can override the differences that people bring to the situation.

What could constitute shared goals of this extraordinary significance? The avoidance of nuclear destruction is one. Protection of the environment is emerging as another, since it may well come to involve jeopardy to the human habitat. The creation of new forms of community, social cohesion, and solidarity in the face of the vast impersonal modern society we have wrought is another. The threat of worldwide economic deterioration might also become salient. At a regional level, the desire to improve economic prospects can impel two or more nations to cooperate in the development of agriculture, transportation, electricity, and water resources, increasing confidence and mutually beneficial interdependence.

These are mainly survival goals, updated to the modern era, where the reference for adaptation goes beyond the sense of belonging in the immediate valued group to identification with a much larger unit or ideal. The current, worldwide epidemic of severe ethnic conflict should help us realize that we are all in this huge leaking boat together in a gathering storm.

The ancient propensity toward narrow identity, harsh intolerance, and deadly intergroup conflict will confront us with new dangers in the next century and challenge us as never before. By the same token it will create a great opportunity to identify the fundamental properties of superordinate goals and their myriad possibilities in the world of small- and large-scale wars that have proven so contagious in recent years. How can all of humanity benefit -- indeed survive -- by adopting new attitudes, practices, and institutions?

Changing Principles of International Diplomacy

In the period following World War II, the international community put all too little emphasis on the protection of minority rights. Concepts of self-determination, sovereignty, and the sanctity of borders prevented outsiders from mediating ethnic tensions within or between states. International law on self-determination limited itself primarily to anti-colonial movements.

When international intervention did occur, it was usually associated with partisan superpower support in the context of Cold War rivalry. In this environment and with its almost infinite respect for the nation-state, the United Nations was virtually helpless to intervene in most serious conflicts. Mediation by governments or nongovernmental organizations in intergroup conflicts also tended to occur only after fighting had erupted between opposing groups. This was the case in the Arab-Israeli disputes, in Ngorno-Karabakh, in Yugoslavia, and in the Sudan.

But with the ending of the Cold War, the growth of a dynamic and interdependent world economy, and the blurring of national boundaries by modern communication and transportation, nations have an opportunity to deal cooperatively with world problems unhampered by ideological rivalries. In particular they can now address seriously the paradoxically hostile separatism that is stirring up new conflicts around the world. They can begin to deal with the severe ecological damage and resource depletion, huge disparities between rich and poor, and denial of aspiration that are at the heart of much of intergroup violence.

Some experts, drawing on years of study and diplomatic experience in dealing with serious conflicts, envision a shift taking place in the nature of international relations -- from the traditional power-oriented, authoritarian, and controlling model toward one that is more complex and multifaceted, in which mutually beneficial political and economic relations are of growing importance.

The older paradigm took it for granted that human beings were overwhelmingly selfish and therefore would respond mainly to coercion. Interests were defined narrowly in terms of power.

This can now usefully be enlarged to a broader view that is more sympathetic to basic human needs for physical and economic security, social justice, and political freedom. Such a view relies less on coercive measures and more on the clarification of fundamental concerns and underlying common interests and on ways to change political environments toward democracy.

An indication of a shift in the paradigms of diplomacy is the recent willingness of states to yield some historically sensitive sovereign prerogatives in the interests of achieving larger political and economic benefits. But progress here is hard-won and subject to regression with little notice.

Still, the remarkably peaceful ending of the Cold War might in due course provide the basis for a new system of international, democratic, nonviolent problem solving aimed ultimately

at prevention of the deadliest conflicts. This is an immense challenge to serious thinkers, penetrating analysts, and innovative practitioners.

A Post-Cold War International System

If aggrieved groups have recourse to a respected external authority -- whether governments, multilateral institutions, nongovernmental organizations, or other bridge-building or mediating links -- they might be less likely to engage in secessionist activities or appeal to their ethnic kin from outside to come to their rescue. Whatever can nurture a more cosmopolitan identity rather than a parochial, narrowly defined ethnic identity will be helpful in the long term.

To this end, the international community can formulate general standards for resolving disputes and for satisfying self-determination claims to a reasonable extent, in the context of an existing state if feasible. It can develop a preventive orientation, monitoring "hot spots" analyzing the potential sources of conflict, and becoming involved early as conflicts emerge. It can analyze ways in which economic access to and participation in the international economy can help ensure adherence to standards of decent behavior in intergroup relations. It can encourage ways of facilitating the growth of mutually beneficial loose associations or confederations.

A new international consensus toward conflict prevention and resolution could support the provision of visible, respected forums for the expression of grievances among the relevant parties and of organized settings that foster empathy and restraint, in which culturally accepted techniques for reconciliation are used to the maximum extent possible. It could instill a process of joint problem solving in which representatives of the different groups mutually explore their respective interests, basic needs, and fervent aspirations. It could have a means of identifying shared goals such as regional economic development and aid in the building of inclusive democratic institutions.

Such a consensus could lead to mechanisms for organizing an ongoing series of reciprocal goodwill gestures; for drafting possible agreements -- even modest next steps -- that show the possibility of finding common ground in a mode of civil discourse; for building institutions where parties can learn about negotiation and democratic ways of coping; and for utilizing multilateral, regional, and nongovernmental resources to create incentives and skills for negotiation, cooperation, and help with economic development.

These desiderata could apply to the resolution of a wide range of large, intergroup conflicts, spanning traditional international relations and contemporary ethnic tensions. But what entities could implement such an international system for preventing the deadliest conflicts? The United Nations? The community of established democracies? Some interplay between the two? Other international mechanisms?

The United Nations

There is a growing interest by the international community in the possibility of broadening the role of the United Nations. With its legitimacy as the most significant global

institution striving for democratic ideals oriented toward a peaceful world order, it might usefully intervene in some “internal affairs” to prevent deadly conflict, render humanitarian assistance, and aid transitions to more democratic systems of governance.

In January 1992, for the first time in the history of the institution, a special meeting of the Security Council of the United Nations was held at the level of heads of state. It was a summit meeting called to examine the functions of the U.N., particularly with respect to conflict resolution. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali was asked to prepare a plan for strengthening the capacity of the U.N. to engage in preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, and peacekeeping. This was an unprecedented occasion and expressed a strong commitment to the original purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter drawn up a half century earlier.

The Secretary-General responded some months later with a remarkable document, “An Agenda for Peace,” which drew upon many ideas and proposals from member states, regional and nongovernmental organizations, and individuals. Some aspects of the document are groundbreaking. In it Boutros-Ghali took note of changes in the concept of sovereignty: “The time of absolute and exclusive sovereignty . . . has passed; its theory was never matched by reality. It is the task of leaders of states today to understand this and to find a balance between the needs of good internal governance and the requirements of an ever more interdependent world.”

The Secretary-General put emphasis on fact-finding and analysis -- to identify at the earliest possible stage the circumstances that could produce serious conflict -- and on the need for preventive diplomacy to resolve the most immediate problems, with attention to underlying causes of conflict. While placing a high priority on the U.N.'s having an early warning system and the means for early intervention, he did not ignore the necessity for it to deal effectively at later stages with its more familiar functions of peacemaking and peacekeeping. Improvement in the former could include strengthening the role of the International Court of Justice (the principal judicial organ of the U.N.) and introducing confidence-building measures, economic assistance, and, if necessary, sanctions and the use of military force. Boutros-Ghali considered the increased demands on the U.N. for peacekeeping and the complex organizational changes that will be necessary if the U.N. is to be more effective in these domains.

He also considered preventive deployment, which goes beyond earlier U.N. practice. There may be circumstances that justify deploying forces prior to the outbreak of fighting, if such help is requested by governments or parties to the fighting. The aim is to limit or control the violence, help ensure that security is maintained, assist in conciliation efforts, even establish a demilitarized zone before a conflict is well established, and provide humanitarian assistance.

To the functions he was asked to comment on, the Secretary-General added a fourth category -- post-conflict peacebuilding -- having the aim of constructing a more durable foundation for peace. The creation of a new environment after a conflict is the counterpart of preventive diplomacy before conflict. While preventive diplomacy seeks to identify at the earliest stage the circumstances that could produce a serious conflict and remove the sources of danger, post-conflict peacebuilding aims to prevent a crisis from recurring. It emphasizes, as

does preventive diplomacy, cooperative efforts to cope with underlying economic, social, and humanitarian problems.

The Secretary-General's report underscored the importance of joint efforts to nurture democratic practices and, by implication, democratic institutions, since so many countries in a state of conflict have had little or no democratic experience. Similarly, in many arenas there is a need for the U.N. to provide technical assistance in the rebuilding phase and to place the conflicting parties on a sounder economic basis for their own internal development. As a practical matter, Boutros-Ghali cited the problem of how to get rid of the millions of mines that now litter the lands where conflicts have gone on. Doing so will restore not only agriculture and transportation but hope and confidence so that citizens can participate fully in the rebuilding. The Secretary-General recognized the importance of working with regional organizations and the nongovernmental sector in carrying out such functions.

Implementing this agenda will necessarily be difficult and the obstacles formidable. If the United Nations is to play these roles effectively, it will require much more substantial and dependable financial and political support than it has ever received before. For this to happen there will need to be a much higher level of public understanding about the U.N.'s current functions and its potential than now exists. And there will need to be some changes in structure and function.

The United Nations is not, and never will be, a world government. It is an intergovernmental organization of sovereign states that seek common ground for cooperation in their long-term self-interest. It is perforce large and multifaceted, disparate in its composition and in the outlook of its members, and emotionally charged from its past history and from current difficulties in the world. As such, it cannot be an optimal instrument for all efforts at preventive diplomacy or conflict resolution. Nevertheless, if it did not exist, something very much like it would have to be invented. There simply has to be a comprehensive, worldwide forum for global issues. Surely it is time to consider how some of its functions, and the components and mechanisms within it, could be extended, and new ones created if necessary, in order to strengthen the hand of the international community in preventing highly lethal conflicts.

The Established Democracies

The democracies of Europe, North America, Japan, and Australia have shown that they can live together peacefully even as they compete. On the other hand, they have failed badly in certain situations, such as Bosnia. Increasingly they are likely to take the lead in formulating international norms of conduct with respect to intergroup relations, the proliferation of highly lethal weaponry, economic development in poorer nations, human rights, and the growth of democratic institutions. They have the technological, economic, and political strength to establish such norms even if tyrannical governments are offended.

The established democracies may act on such issues with the approval of or on behalf of the U.N., or they may cooperate with it informally. Usually their actions will be political and economic in nature rather than military. In almost all cases they will need to consult widely with each other on a systematic basis.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is a prime example of the ability of established democracies to work together -- initially to counteract an aggressive Soviet Union, provide for European security, and foster German recovery in a democratic mode. Could a similar alliance, involving a wider coalition of democracies, be organized to ensure security on a worldwide basis, fuel economic growth with fairness, protect cultural diversity, and foster democratic values?

Who Else Can Help?

As important as the United Nations is, there are other organizations of the international community that could be effective in preventing deadly conflicts. The involvement of the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council may be crucial for some regional conflicts, as in Cambodia, but other disputes may be handled at the regional level. The potential of regional mechanisms for dispute resolution in intergroup conflicts deserves serious attention in the next decade. The European Community, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Council of Europe and its European Court of Human Rights, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the Organization of American States, the Organization of African Unity, and the Arab League all need strengthening in this regard.

Various specialized international organizations, such as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the Law of the Sea Tribunal, can play a useful role in resolving disagreements surrounding a particular set of issues. Bilateral arrangements can also be created to adjudicate disputes between nations. The U.S.–Iran Claims Tribunal demonstrated that two hostile nations with different languages, laws, and goals were able to settle matters of considerable importance to both sides.

Nongovernmental organizations can also play an important part in resolving disputes, cooperating with the U.N. and with regional organizations. Former President Jimmy Carter, for example, has established through the Carter Center in Atlanta an international network for mediation and conflict resolution.

The Scientific Outlook

The scientific community is probably the closest approximation we now have to a truly international community, sharing certain basic interests, values, and standards as well as a fundamental curiosity about the nature of matter, life, behavior, and the universe. The shared quest for understanding is one that has no inherent boundaries. In any situation of potentially serious conflict, the scientific outlook can contribute to the construction of a framework for conflict resolution and for building a peaceful world. It takes a world view that embodies multiple truths, not some simple ultimate truth; it seeks evidence, and it is prepared to learn from experience. This same empirical spirit is frequently helpful in defusing passions aroused by social conflict. It provides one of the pathways toward a broader-than-conventional perspective that can be learned by all peoples and that can build bridges across cultures.

In the realm of scientific research, the interactions of biological, psychological, and social processes in the development of human aggressiveness leading to violent conflict must constitute an important frontier in the decades ahead. A shared commitment to the humane uses of science and technology could offer a great vista of hope.

Bridge Building

This analysis suggests the importance of having cross-cutting or overlapping group memberships in the modern world. Cross-cutting relations are those that connect subgroups of society or connect nations in ways that overcome in-group/out-group distinctions and prejudicial stereotypes. They involve the opportunity for members of alien, suspicious, or hostile groups to spend time together, to work together, to play together, and even to live together for extended periods of time, gaining a sense of shared humanity.

On the international level, there must be concerted efforts to expand favorable contact between people from different groups and nations. Some measure of comprehension of a strange culture is vital. Educational, cultural, and scientific exchanges can be helpful. At a deeper level, joint projects involving sustained cooperation can provide, if only on a small scale, an experience of working together toward a superordinate goal. There are many ways to break down antagonisms between groups or, preferably, prevent them from arising in the first place. International organizations can do much to promote empathic personal contact and overlapping loyalties that cut across in-group/out-group antagonisms.

Those of us who have a deep sense of belonging in groups that cut across ethnic or national lines may serve to bridge different groups and help others move toward a wider sense of social identity. Building such bridges will need many people interacting across traditional barriers on a basis of mutual respect. Nothing in our history as a species would suggest there is a readiness for such a wider sense of personal identity; yet it must be possible to engender this in the next century and to do so on a broader scale than ever before.

Social Education

There are other ways to create positive connections between groups. Families, schools, community organizations, religious institutions, and the media throughout the years of human growth and development are pivotal institutions that can shape attitudes and interpersonal skills toward either decent relations or hatred and violence. In the twenty-first century it will be necessary in child raising to put deliberate, explicit emphasis on developing prosocial orientations and a sense of worth based not on depreciation of others but on the constructive attributes of oneself and others. Taking turns, sharing, and cooperating, especially in learning and problem solving -- these norms, established on a simple basis in the first few years of life, can open the way to beneficial human relationships that can have significance throughout a person's life.

A secure attachment of infant to mother or other adult caregiver provides a crucial foundation for the development of prosocial behavior. It is important to focus on the nature of parental behavior that can promote or retard these tendencies. Not only schools but religious and

community organizations should foster positive reciprocity, cross-cutting relations, awareness of superordinate goals, and a mutual aid ethic in children and adolescents. The largely unfulfilled educational potential of the media can also be helpful in improving intergroup relations, as “Sesame Street” has shown. These same generic orientations and skills can be extended from childhood all the way up through adulthood to membership in larger units, possibly even including international relations in due course.

The painfully difficult effort to achieve decent, fair, peaceful relations among diverse human groups is an enterprise that must be renewed. While weapons of mass destruction pose the greatest danger, economic decline and environmental degradation will be a growing challenge to survival for many in the years ahead. People of humane and democratic inclination will need sustained cooperation throughout the world to build effective systems for dealing with these great problems. Ideas are emerging, analysis is proceeding, useful models exist. The current turmoil could provide a constructive stimulus for practical arrangements that help us learn to live together at last.